

REMARKS

Claims 19-22 are pending in the subject application.

Claim 19 has been amended to replace the term " $(CH_2)_m(CH=CH)_pY$ " with the term " $(CH_2)_mY$." Support for the amendment to claim 19 can be found in the original specification at, for example, page 7, line 19.

The specification has been amended to indicate that parent U.S. nonprovisional application Serial No. 09/924,709 has now issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,750,215.

No new matter has been added. Entry of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

I. Objection to Claim 19

The Examiner objected to claim 19 because of an informality. In particular, the Examiner stated that "the recitation of $(CH=CH)_pY$ is unnecessary since $p=0$." As suggested by the Examiner, claim 19 has been amended to replace the term " $(CH_2)_m(CH=CH)_pY$ " with the term " $(CH_2)_mY$." Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendment to claim 19 has fully addressed the Examiner's objection, and request that the objection to claim 19 be withdrawn.

II. Objection to the Specification

The Examiner stated that "[t]he status of nonprovisional parent application(s) (whether patented or abandoned) to which applicants claim domestic priority should be included." The specification has been updated to indicate parent U.S. application Serial No. 09/924,709, filed August 8, 2001, has issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,750,215. Applicants respectfully submit that the above amendment to the specification has fully addressed the Examiner's objection and request that the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 19-22 Based on the Ground of Nonstatutory Obviousness-type Double Patenting

The Examiner rejected claims 19-22 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,750,215. In particular, the Examiner stated that "[a]lthough the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because there is significant overlap between the instant claims 19-22 and claims 1-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,750,215." Applicants disagree with the Examiner's position. However, in order to advance prosecution, Applicants are

submitting herewith a terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c).


In view of the above, Applicants request that the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 18-22 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request prompt consideration of the pending claims and early allowance of the application. No additional fee is believed due. However, if any fee is due, the Examiner is authorized to charge the fee to Applicants' Deposit Account No. 16-1445.

If the Examiner wishes to comment or discuss any aspect of this application or response, Applicants' undersigned agent invites the Examiner to call him at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



David L. Kershner
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 53,112

Date: January 20, 2006

Pfizer Inc.
Patent Department, 5th Floor
150 East 42nd Street
New York, NY 10017-5755
(212) 733-0538